DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 806 SP 029 006

TITLE Review of National Teachers Examination by the Oregon State System of Higher Education. 23 Specialty Area Tests from October Review. 2 Specialty Area Tests from May Review.
INSTITUTION Oregon State System of Higher Education, Eugene.
PUB DATE 15 Nov 85
NOTE 95p.; For related document, see SP 029 007.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Higher Education; Minimum Competency Testing; Preservice Teacher Education; Teaching Skills; *Test Format; *Test Items; Test Reviews; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *National Teacher Examinations; Oregon

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes findings on 26 National Teacher Examination specialty area tests provided by faculty reviewers from five Oregon institutions of higher education. Reviewers were asked to judge tests on the basis of: (1) whether students at the reviewer's institution would have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge measured in test items; (2) importance of test items for persons endorsed in that specialty; and (3) technical adequacy of items. Subjects reviewed were: (1) art education; (2) audiology; (3) biology and general science; (4) business education; (5) chemistry, physics, and general science; (6) early childhood education; (7) education of the mentally retarded; (8) educational administration and supervision; (9) English language and literature; (10) French; (11) German; (12) guidance counselor; (13) home economics education; (14) industrial arts education; (15) introduction to the teaching of reading; (16) library media specialist; (17) mathematics; (18) music education; (19) physical education; (20) reading specialist; (21) social studies; (22) Spanish; (23) speech communication; (24) education in the elementary school; and (25) professional knowledge. Reviewers' comments on individual test items are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CONTENTS

Page

Background 1

Procedures Followed 2

Findings 3

Limitations of the Review 5

October Review

Art Education 11
Audiology 13
Biology and General Science 15
Business Education 18
Chemistry, Physics, and General Science 21
Early Childhood Education 25
Education of the Mentally Retarded 29
Educational Administration and Supervision 33
English Language and Literature 37
French 40
German 42
Guidance Counselor 44
Home Economics Education 47
Industrial Arts Education 49
Introduction to the Teaching of Reading 51
Library Media Specialist 55
Mathematics 58
Music Education 61
Physical Education 64
Reading Specialist 67
Social Studies 71
Spanish 74
Speech Communication 76

May Review

Education in the Elementary School 80
Professional Knowledge 84

Appendix A: Faculty Reviewers 89

BACKGROUND

Developments Nationwide

Considerable pressure has been placed upon colleges and universities to test the competency of their newly prepared teachers in subject matter and professional methodology prior to certification. Numerous states now require that newly prepared teachers pass tests in subject matter and/or professional methodology as a condition of certification.

As of October 1985, fourteen states required use of the Educational Testing Service's National Teacher Examination specialty area (norm-referenced subject matter) tests for certification:

- Arkansas
- California (in lieu of courses)
- Florida (career ladder assignment)
- Hawaii (hiring)
- Indiana
- Kentucky
- Louisiana
- Mississippi
- New Jersey (alternative certification)
- New Mexico
- North Carolina
- South Carolina (specially developed)
- Virginia
- Maryland.

Four other states required passing specialty area tests developed by National Evaluation Systems (criterion-referenced subject matter tests):

- Alabama
- Oklahoma
- Georgia
- West Virginia.

Nine states required (or will be equiring) observational assessments of teaching performance as a condition of certification:

- Arizona
- Georgia
- Oklahoma
- Florida
- North Carolina
- South Carolina
- Tennessee
- New Mexico (under development)
- Texas (under development).

Developments in Oregon

Several developments are underway in Oregon related to the teacher testing issue:

- During this past legislative session, the Educational Coordinating Commission introduced a bill that would require subject matter testing for prospective teachers. Although the bill was not approved, there is growing pressure on the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, professional teachers associations, and higher education to determine what should be done in Oregon on the issue of competency testing.

- This past fall, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission adopted an "add an-endorsement" plan that goes into effect January, 1986. The new ruling will enable teachers already certified with a basic certificate to become certified in another endorsement if they pass the National Teacher Examination in that specialty area.

- New standards issued by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) include a requirement that colleges and universities use standardized measures of adequacy of preparation of newly prepared graduates. Since the Board of Higher Education requires that State System teacher education programs be accredited by NCATE, the System will have to determine how the new NCATE standards will be met in the near future.

In the report of the Deans of the Schools of Education to the Board of Higher Education in November, 1984, the State System indicated it would pilot the use of various competency tests in teacher education to look at the advisability of using these tests within the system. Before moving in this direction, however, it seemed advisable to look at the tests available nationwide.

It was determined, therefore, that OSSHE initiate a review of the major tests being used in teacher education nationwide for the benefit of its institutions.

PROCEDURES FOLLOWED

A two-step process was selected: four tests were reviewed in May, 1983, and 25 other specialty area tests were reviewed in fall, 1985.

The May review was conducted at three sites (Western Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Eastern Oregon State College) with 45 faculty from Portland State University, Oregon State University, University of Oregon, Western Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Eastern Oregon State College participating in the reviews. The following tests were reviewed at the May session:

- Communications Test (Listening, Reading, Writing)

- General Knowledge Test (Science, Math, Social Science, and Literature and Fine Arts)

- Professional Knowledge

- Elementary Education.

A report summarizing the findings provided by faculty reviewers ("Review of National Teachers Examination by the Oregon State System of Higher Education: Communications Skills, General Knowledge, Professional Knowledge, and Elementary Education Tests") was issued July 1, 1985.

The fall review of the NTE specialty tests was held at a single site, Western Oregon State College, with 58 faculty from Western Oregon State College, Portland State University, University of Oregon, Oregon State University and Southern Oregon State College participating. A representative from Educational Testing Service was present to ensure that test security measures were followed.

Because of an ETS requirement, no more than four faculty were permitted to review each test. Also because of an "eleventh" hour change in the expectation that tests could be reviewed at all OSSHE institutions, it was not possible to identify four faculty members who could be available to review each test at the one date and test site selected. Every effort was made to insure that faculty from different institutions were able to participate in the reviews of each subject area test.

Each of the NTE specialty area tests is a two-hour test, although the items range in number from 120 to 180 per test.

Faculty were asked to rate each item on the test by indicating a "yes," "no," or "uncertain" to two questions:

1. Would students preparing in this subject endorsement at your institution have an opportunity to learn this?

2. Do you believe it is important for a person endorsed in this area to have knowledge of this item?

A third question asked faculty to rate the technical adequacy of each item as "adequate" or "inadequate:"

3. Is this item technically adequate, i.e., questions contains no inaccuracies or ambiguities, response options contain only one best answer, etc.?

Faculty were also asked to respond to a number of other questions. These are reflected in the "comments" section included with findings on individual tests.

FINDINGS

Findings for each specialty area test are broken out on pages 11-88. Findings are presented in a standard format as follows:

- Specifications of the test are outlined by categories of knowledge covered and approximate number of items devoted to each category. These specifications are taken directly from "Descriptions of the NTE Tests: Core Battery and Specialty Area," published by ETS, 1985.

- Grade levels addressed in test and/or level of training needed by test takers are indicated. This information is taken from "Descriptions of the NTE Tests: Core Battery and Specialty Area," published by ETS, 1985.

- Faculty ratings on "opportunity," "importance," and "technical adequacy" are listed by the institution of the participating faculty. In some cases, faculty reviewers elected to respond to open-ended questions on the review form only. The number providing an item-by-item response, therefore, is somewhat less than the number of participating faculty.

- Faculty responses to open-ended questions are provided.

An analysis of the results of faculty reviews of the 23 specialty area tests reviewed in October and two other specialty area tests (elementary education and professional knowledge) reviewed last May are presented in two summary tables.

In analyzing the NTE tests for OSSHE acceptability, it was decided that each test should meet all of the following three criteria:

- Students should have the opportunity to learn at least 85 percent of the knowledge contained in test items in the preparation program at the campus, based on ratings of a majority of faculty reviewers.

- At least 85 percent of the test items should be judged important for a person endorsed in this area to know by a majority of the faculty reviewers.

- At least 85 percent of the items should be judged technically adequate by the majority of faculty reviewers.

Table 1 describes the percentage of faculty who rated items "yes" on opportunity and importance and "adequate" on technical adequacy.

Table 2 provides a breakout of 25 specialty area tests by:

- those that meet OSSHE standards of acceptability, followed by recommendations or caveats for the tests that meet acceptability standards;

- those that do not, followed by the reasons tests do not meet acceptability standards.

Table 2 indicates that seven of the 25 specialty area tests meet OSSHE standards of acceptability. Eighteen of the tests do not meet OSSHE standards of acceptablility, with the reasons generally equally distributed among opportunity, importance, and technical adequacy problems.

LIMITATIONS OF THE REVIEW

There are some possible limitations that should be considered in reviewing the procedures and interpreting the results of the OSSHE NTE review.

- Too small a number of faculty were able to review the tests. A recommended 12-15 faculty per test should have been involved in the review. Because of ETS security requirements and the limited financial resources of OSSHE, a more desirable number of faculty could not be involved in the reviews.

- Because of ETS security requirements, faculty were not able to review test answers with the questions. This situation may have caused faculty to read the various answer choices with more scrutiny than if the answers had been provided. This close reading may have resulted in some of the high technical inadequacy ratings given to several of the tests.

- Some faculty whose expertise was primarily in the subject area lacked knowledge of the overall curriculum of the teacher preparation program and, therefore, rated numerous items with an "uncertain" designation. In order to take this situation into account, a designation for further review has been recommended for those tests that failed to meet the OSSHE standard where the "uncertain" ratings were the only reason for holding a test back from an acceptability rating.

Table 1

SUMMARY OF FACULTY REVIEWS OF THE NTE SPECIALTY AREA TESTS FOR "OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN KNOWLEDGE CONTAINED IN ITEMS," "IMPORTANCE OF ITEMS FOR PERSON ENDORSED IN SPECIALTY TO KNOW," AND "TECHNICAL ADEQUACY" OF ITEMS

NTE Specialty Test	No. of Reviewers Providing Item-by-Item Ratings	Percent of Test Items Rated "Yes" for Opportunity	Percent of Test Items Rated "Yes" for Importance	Percent of Items Rated "Adequate" for Technical Adequacy	Does the Test Meet the OSSHE Standard of 85% by Majority of Faculty for: Opportunity?	Importance?	Adequacy?
October Review							
Art	3	53[A], 96, 95	65[B], 96, 84	75, 99, 78	Yes	No	No
Audiology	2	91, 24[A]	95, 94	89, 91	No	Yes	Yes
Biology & General Science	3	98, 94, 86	98, 84[A], 94	97, 99, 81	Yes	Yes	Yes
Business	2	90, 82[A]	80, 91	73, 91	No	No	No
Chemistry, Physics, & Gen. Science	3	93, 97, 89	91, 99, 87	91, 93, 85	Yes	Yes	Yes
Early Childhood	3	75[A], 95, 89	93, 96, 91	79, 93, 80	Yes	Yes	No
Mentally Retarded	4	80[B], 91, 76[A], 77[B]	76[B], 88, 71[A], 41[A]	73, 65, 97, 59	No	No	No
Ed. Administration & Supervision	4	100, 59[C], 59[B]	97, 32[C], 55[C], 63[B]	83, 31, 61, 61	No	No	No
English Language & Literature	3	41[A], 53[C], 41[A]	67[C], 62[B], 42[B]	99, 92, 97	No	No	Yes
French	1	100	97	Not Rated	Yes	Yes	—*
German	1	82	72[B]	76	No	No	No
Guidance Counselor	-	Not Rated Item-by-Item	Not Rated Item-by-Item	Not Rated Item-by-Item	—	—	—
Home Economics	2	92, 88	94, 89	85, 82	Yes	Yes	No
Industrial Arts	1	65[B]	59[C]	57	No	No	No
Introduction to Teaching Reading	3	65[A], 68[A], 83[B]	85, 67[C], 76[B]	94, 71, 68	No	No	No
Library Media Spec.	3	73[B], 61[A], 81	84[B], 73[A], 81	68, 33, 51	No	No	No
Math	3	81[A], 88, 83[A]	73[A], 75, 84	90, 72, 84	No	No	No
Music Education	4	80[A], 94, 97, 89	66[A], 85, 92, 85	89, 93, 78, 89	Yes	Yes	Yes

NTE Specialty Test	No. of Reviewers Providing Item-by-Item Ratings	Percent of Test Items Rated "Yes" for Opportunity	Percent of Test Items Rated "Yes" for Importance	Percent of Items Rated "Adequate" for Technical Adequacy	Does the Test Meet the OSSHE Standard of 85% by Majority of Faculty for: Opportunity?	Importance?	Adequacy?
Physical Education	3	59[A], 83, 95	41[C], 73, 75	53, 59, 88	Yes	No	No
Reading Specialist	3	79[B], 89, 88	75[B], 82[B], 89	41, 67, 74	Yes	Yes	No
Spanish	1	90	78[A]	86	Yes	No	Yes*
Speech Communication	3	28[B], 82[B], 89	25[B], 77[A], 77[A]	87, 81, 79	No	No	No
Social Studies	2	64[A], 98	97	89	No	Yes	Yes
May Review							
Elementary Ed.	5	97, 94, 99, 87, 85	97, 93, 90, 79, 82	Not Reviewed in Same Manner as Oct.	Yes	Yes	—
Prof. Knowledge Section 1		80, 40, 100, 86, 97, 88, 77, 83, 97, 86	74, 40, 100, 97, 74, 89, 66, 69, 100, 54	Not Reviewed in Same Manner as Oct.	Yes	No	—
Section 2		40, 54, 71, 66, 91, 91, 77, 100, 89	40, 54, 71, 66, 91, 91, 77, 100, 89	Not Reviewed in Same Manner as Oct.	No	No	—
Section 3		86, 77, 91, 29, 86 63, 74, 71	69, 94, 69, 29, 66, 77, 83, 66	Not Reviewed in Same Manner as Oct.	No	No	—

*Oral proficiency test must be added.

A = The major other response by this faculty member was "uncertain" (more than 15% of items).
B = The major other response by this faculty member was "no" (more than 15% of items).
C = This faculty member had a substantial number of "no" and "uncertain" responses (both over 15% of items).

Table 2

SUMMARY OF ACCEPTABILITY OF NTE SPECIALTY AREA TESTS REVIEWED IN MAY AND OCTOBER, 1985

OSSHE Standard for Acceptability

- Students preparing in the subject endorsement must have an opportunity to learn at least 85 percent of the test items at the institutions, as judged by a majority of faculty reviewers.
- At least 85 percent of the items comprising the test must be judged important for a person endorsed in this area to know, as judged by a majority of faculty reviewers.
- At least 85 percent of the test questions must be judged technically adequate by a majority of faculty reviewers.

Test	Test Is Acceptable	Test Is Not Acceptable	Reason(s)* Test Is Not Acceptable and/or Recommendations For Tests That Are Acceptable
Reviewed in October			
Art		X	Does not meet I or TA standard.
Audiology	X		Needs further review for O.** Test takers should be master's level.
Biology and General Science	X		Has some inadequate coverage in content (e.g., genetics, cell physiology, zoology, molecular biology, nature of science). Test covers some physics questions that may not be appropriate for Oregon biology endorsement.
Business Education		X	Does not meet I or TA standard. Needs further review for O.**
Chemistry, Physics, and General Science	X		Okay for physics/chemistry but lacking adequate earth science emphasis and too difficult for Integrated Science endorsement. Two hour time limit is not long enough.
Early Childhood		X	Does not meet TA standard.
Education of Mentally Retarded		X	Does not meet O, I, or TA standard. Content is inappropriate for Oregon severly handicapped learner endorsement.

Test	Test Is Acceptable	Test Is Not Acceptable	Reason(s)* Test Is Not Acceptable and/or Recommendations For Tests That Are Acceptable
Educ. Administration and Supervision		X	Does not meet I or TA standard. Needs further review for O.**
English Language and Literature		X	Does not meet I standard. Needs further review for O.**
French	X		Oral proficiency must be added.
German		X	Does not meet O, I, or TA standard. Oral proficiency must be added.
Guidance Counselor		X	Heavy emphasis on secondary level career guidance is not consistent with current curriculum nor increasing use of career education teachers. Too little emphasis on shifting focus in counseling to mental health-related issues.
Home Economics		X	Does not meet TA standard.
Industrial Arts		X	Does not meet O, I, or TA standard.
Intro. to Teaching of Reading		X	Does not meet I or TA standard. Needs further review for O.**
Library Media Spec.		X	Does not meet O, I, or TA standard.
Mathematics		X	Does not meet I or TA standard. Needs further review for O.**
Music	X		Practical demonstration of classroom competence should be built into test or must have been demonstrated through student teaching.
Physical Education		X	Does not meet I or TA standard. Needs further review for O.**
Reading Specialist		X	Does not meet I or TA standard.
Spanish		X	Needs further review for I.*** Oral proficiency must be added.
Speech Communication		X	Does not meet O standard. Needs further review for I.***

Test	Test Is Acceptable	Test Is Not Acceptable	Reason(s)* Test Is Not Acceptable and/or Recommendations For Tests That Are Acceptable
Social Studies	X		Needs further review for O.** Test seems more appropriate for history than social studies. More emphasis should be placed on developing nations.
Reviewed in May			
Elementary Education	X		Data from May review indicate the test meets O and I standard. TA was not reviewed in same manner in May so no standard is being applied. If students are expected to answer 90-100 percent correctly, test may be too difficult. The test may be too long for what is being tested. Performance should be tested as well.
Professional Knowledge		X	Data from May review indicate the test does not meet O and I standard for a majority of sections of the test. TA was not reviewed in same manner in May so no standard is being applied.
Total:	7	18	

*Code used for reasons is as follows: O = opportunity, I = importance, TA = technically adequate.

**Faculty "uncertain" responses indicate that further review must be made to determine if students have the opportunity to learn the majority of items covered on this test.

***Faculty "uncertain" responses indicate that further review must be made to determine if faculty believe the majority of items are important for a person endorsed in this area to know.

ART EDUCATION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Survey and analysis of world art • Survey of world art • Art analysis • Influences	52-53
Materials, tools, and techniques, and processes of art • Tools and materials • Techniques and processes • Effects • Elements of principles of design	67-68
Professional practices • Knowledge of curriculum, teaching methods, and evaluation • Knowledge of social-psychological bases for teaching art • Knowledge of profession of art education	30
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

Questions may be specific to a particular grade level, to the elementary level (nursery-6), or to secondary level (7-12). Some questions apply to several grade levels.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
UO	79	17	54	98	52	0	112	38
WOSC	144	1	5	144	0	6	148	2
WOSC	142	7	1	126	23	1	117	33

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Yes, in most instances.
   - Only superficially. The root content reflected in the questions is significant to the field and, therefore, present in our curriculum; but the individual items cover

trivial bits of fragmented information, poorly conceived, and philosophically inconsistent.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

    - Good range.

    - Because it is easy to ask questions concerning studio technique and process, and difficult to find meaningful questions regarding aesthetics, criticism, and history, the test is "studio top-heavy."

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

    - Yes, but there are many nitty gritty questions that don't serve much purpose.

    - The test would not be difficult for my students, but would not reflect the foundational knowledge base in both theory and practice necessary for meaningful teaching.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

    - Very few questions on eastern (far and near) art or Africa and almost nothing on South America.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

    - It would be more meaningful than the CBEST for my students, but still not reflective of what one needs to know to teach art.

6. Other comments.

    - It is incomprehensible to me that someone who could simply pass a single test could be considered equally qualified as one of my students who spends a minimum of 28 hours in the studio, 9 hours in art history, and 29 hours learning current theory and practice in my field. It is sad when expediency overrules sound educational practice.

AUDIOLOGY

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Basic science	30
• Acoustics and psychoacoustics	
• Anatomy and physiology	
• Statistics	
• Acoustic phonetics	
Development and Pathology of the Auditory System	18
• Embryology	
• Auditory development in children or reaction to sound as a function of age	
• Effects of aging on the auditory system	
• Auditory pathology or hearing disorders	
Evaluation	50
• Use of case history information	
• Behavioral test procedures	
• Physiological test procedures	
• Interpretation of test results	
• Screening procedures	
Habilitation and Rehabilitation	45
• Surgical and/or medical treatment	
• Hearing aids	
• Effects of hearing impairment on speech and language of children and adults, including moderately, severely, and profoundly impaired	
• The educational, vocational, and psychosocial implications of hearing impairments on children and adults, including moderately, severely, and profoundly impaired	
• Evaluation, educational and remediation procedures	
Speech and Language	7
• Normal development	
• Sociolinguistic differences	
• Language disorders	
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test is designed to measure academic preparation in and knowledge of the field, relating to all grade levels.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
UO	136	5	9	143	1	6	134	16
WOSC	36	78	36	141	0	9	136	14

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Yes, if they have completed a rigorous master's level course of study in audiology.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - Pretty heavily into "medical-clinical" and scarce on "educational" audiology items.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Yes, at master's level.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - None.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - Not in present form -- does not relate sufficiently to school-related activities of educational (public school) audiologists. Needs to be more assessment rehabilitation-oriented for K-12 and not so heavily into medical-clinical-technical-adult matters.

6. Other comments.

   - Items concerning acoustic reflex are sometimes ambiguous, distinctions might be made between ipsilateral and contralateral types in early test questions.

BIOLOGY AND GENERAL SCIENCE

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Biological Science	88
• Molecular and cellular	
• Organismal	
• Populational levels of organization	
Physical Science	64
• Chemistry	
• Physics	
• Astronomy and space science	
• Geology	
• Oceanography	
• Meteorology	
History, Philosophy and Methodology of Science	8
Total Items	160

Grade Levels

The test measures competence to teach biology and general science at the secondary school level.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
UO	156	1	3	156	1	3	155	5
PSU	151	0	9	135	5	20	159	1
OSU	138	0	22	150	2	8	130	30

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Yes. However, Oregon's biology endorsement does not include a requirement of physics.
   - Generally.

- The test is inadequate with respect to genetics, cell physiology, zoology, and molecular biology.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - For general science, okay. For biology, the physics questions may not be material students are familiar with since physics is not part of biology endorsement requirements.

   - Subject matter content balance is okay. The test does not deal with skills necessary to help student comprehend and learn effectively. Unique professional knowledge for a beginning teacher is adequately addressed.

   - Does not focus enough attention on genetics, cell physiology, zoology, molecular biology, and biochemistry.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Yes. This test would certainly measure an adequate understanding or basic principles of biology, chemistry, geology, and physics.

   - Seems reasonable.

   - The test tends to focus too much on fact/recall. Those questions concerning application/analysis are generally good, but more are needed.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - None noted.

   - No.

   - None noted.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - Yes, It would seem to be a useful means to insure a minimum level of common understanding of basic science principles.

- Subject matter knowledge has not been perceived as a problem with our students. The only reason I can see for using the test might be to gather baseline data for assessing any effects of changes in the teacher training program requirements.

- A "content area" exam is needed but this particular exam needs more revision and balanced treatment of subject matter.

6. Other comments.

- More questions concerning the nature of science (inherent values and assumptions of theory, law, principles, hypotheses, etc.) are needed.

BUSINESS EDUCATION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Business Information	60
• Mathematics for business	
• Communication for business	
• Consumer education	
• Job standards, work standards, business ethics	
• Free enterprise, entrepreneurship, small business organizations	
• Government and banking	
• Business law	
• Economics	
Professional Business Education	40
• Career education	
• Current trends and issues	
• Methodologies and teaching strategies	
• Professional and student organizations, professional literature, vocational legislation, philosophy of business education	
• Mission and objectives of business education	
• Use and interpretation of related research, counseling in business education, community relations, advisory committees	
• Curriculum planning and program development	
• Department management	
• Classroom management	
• Standards	
Areas of Specialization Within Business Education	60
• Typewriting and keyboarding	
• Shorthand and transcription	
• Office procedures	
• Accounting	
• Data processing	
• Marketing and distribution	
Total Items	160

Grade Level

The test is broad in scope to include the variety of business education programs offered to students. It emphasizes core knowledge and cognitive skills common to business teachers.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
OSU	144	6	0	128	28	4	117	43
SOSC	131	0	29	145	0	15	146	4

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Our curriculum has three options -- information processing/accounting, basic business, and marketing. Thus those specialty areas would result in differing levels of expertise for nonspecialty area. Shorthand is being deleted; microcomputers with various software application is being focused on.

   - Yes, the test was relatively comprehensive of our curriculum.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - There seems to be more emphasis on personal finance and general business than information systems. Accounting seemed balanced. Introductory level in typewriting is changing due to microcomputers in the grade schools.

   - Am concerned that three types of business education majors will be responsible for all 160 questions. Approximately 19 of the 160 questions are geared directly and only to the office education majors. The basic business and distributive education majors would not have an opportunity to gain the specific knowledge regarding shorthand and/or office procedures in their studies in Oregon.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Most items are well written. Some are excessively wordy and thus very confusing.

   - Yes. The test was very fair with the exception of 19 questions being geared to the office education person.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - No.
   - No.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - No. The basic reason is the specialty areas of accounting and marketing would not respond well to the secretarial questions nor as a total to the questions on shorthand.
   - Yes. If there were two versions -- one with and one without the previously mentioned 19 questions. No, not if the test remains in its current state.

6. Other comments.

   - Overall, it's a test of basic knowledge. While teaching methodology of skill areas may be tested, skills themselves must be tested by the same activity. I do question the value of the computational questions. Some questions were appropriate for 5th year or standard endorsement rather than 4th year degree, basic endorsement.
   - The questions for the most part were fair and they provided a comprehensive review of our business education curriculum.

CHEMISTRY, PHYSICS AND GENERAL SCIENCE

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Major Ideas of Chemistry and Physics • Particulate nature of matter • Conservation laws • Second law of thermodynamics • States of matter • Interactions • Quantization • Statistical behavior	23
Chemistry • Stoichiometric calculations (Mole concept) • Kinetic molecular theory • The periodic table • Kinetics and reaction mechanisms • Equilibrium • Solutions — electrolytes, acids and bases, hydrolysis, colligative properties • Oxidation-reduction • Bonds and molecular geometry • Descriptive chemistry — organic, inorganic, biochemistry	45
Physics • Mechanics • Heat • Electricity and magnetism • Optics — geometric, physical, quantum • Waves — sound and light • Microstructures — particles and interactions • Reference frames and relativity	45
General Science • Astronomy • Geology • Meteorology • Biology	37
Total Items	150

Grade Level

The test measures preparation for teaching one or both of the physical sciences and/or general science in either junior or senior high school.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
OSU	139	0	6	136	5	9	136	14
UO	146	0	4	149	0	1	139	11
UO	142	4	4	131	15	4	127	23

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Depends upon the point of view of the teacher. There is almost no science in this test. Isolated facts are tested. A dictionary is not a scientist.
   - Generally yes -- but certainly does not go into enough depth for a student certified in physical science-physics. This would be a minimum level of knowledge.
   - Yes for our physics/chemistry endorsement area. Lack of an adequate earth science emphasis for our integrated science endorsement and too sophisticated in the biology, chemistry, and physics areas.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - Yes. Quite reasonable in this respect.
   - I liked the questions on student responses in class and student lab reports. Definitely probes beyond subject matter content. But I doubt that you can adequately test "skills necessary to help pupils" in a multiple choice exam!
   - Many questions are general vocabulary and simple math. Some measure test-taking skills. Questions 136-150 measure short-term memory and are exhausting to answer. Some questions would be easy with a calculator. Strange to not use the skills the student may have.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Not probing at a level deep enough for a student to be certified in physical sciences-physics. This exam is just

at the general physics level with little of modern physics.

- Our chemistry/physics endorsement students could handle the questions in that area but would have trouble with the biology-related items. The test is too difficult for most of our intergrated science endorsement students.

- One has no way of estimating difficulty without seeing response curves. The content is not hard but the questions makes it seem a hard test.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - No.

   - None.

   - Yes. A good student with slower English skills will not do well. Compute the reading rate just to read the test.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - Yes for students who petition to substitute agriculture or engineering courses for courses in the science disciplines.

   - No. Questions are adequate for testing minimal knowledge for physical science-physics certification. Time constraint for exam is too great. Need more than two hours to really be able to think about these questions. Exam would be usable for setting minimal level if more time were given. Could not substitute for course requirements and minimum grade requirements in courses.

   - No. A 120-minute sample of four years of education is not enough. Course grades in chemistry and physics will do a far better job than this attempt at measuring a skill.

6. Other comments.

   - A modified and shortened version of this test would be preferable. The physics and chemistry items (modified from review feedback) with the most important biology items would be attractive for use in screening chemistry/physics teacher candidates at the senior, post-baccalaureate, and graduate level. A slightly less rigorous physics, chemistry, biology section supplemented by more earth science items would be attractive for

integrated science teacher candidates at the senior, post-baccalaureate, and graduate levels.

- When I say a question is not adequate, I mean that it is not good from the standpoint of test construction. Also, this test will most likely be factorly impure; a structural analysis would be interesting. There are probably four factors; two of which are related. The test will be reliable because of G. saturation, not because of good measurement of science.

  Take 20 top science teachers. The variances in their scores will probably be greater than the difference between themselves and 20 low rated science teachers.

  Take a close look at reading time. Each question contains 110 words. There are 16,500 words in the test. At a 350 words per minute reading rate, reading time alone would take up 47 minutes. 120 minutes (two-hour test) minus 47 = 72 minutes to respond. This allows about 31 seconds time for each question. Think about this in relation to bias!

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Knowledge and Understanding of the Nature of Growth, Development and Learning of Young Children	79
• Aspects of development -- physical, personal-social, intellectual	
• Factors that influence development -- biological, familial, nutritional/hygienic	
• Contributions of major streams of developmental theory	
Ability to Judge Appropriateness of Teaching Behaviors, Curriculum Organization, and Activities for Children (3-8) in Relation to Growth, Development and Learning	71
• Managing the physical learning environment	
• Planning, selecting and implementing appropriate curriculum experience	
• Planning, selecting, and evaluating formal and informal assessment and diagnostic instruments/procedures	
• Maintaining useful records of a child's progress	
• Recognizing how the teacher's behaviors affect the learning and development of young children	
• Helping children learn to manage their own behavior	
• Maintaining effective interactions and communication with parents and other adults in the learning setting	
• Using family-community resources in implementing programs	
• Knowing legal responsibility and regulations that impact on teaching	
• Understanding major streams of curriculum theory and development	
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test measures academic competence in early childhood education.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
OSU	113	0	37	139	0	11	118	7
WOSC	143	1	6	144	1	5	139	11
UO	134	2	14	136	3	11	120	30

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - More or less with an over-emphasis on social/affective developments and de-emphasis of cognitive development in my view.
   - Complete in mentioning all curricular areas; however, the questions seem to be too general. For example, a few illustrative breakdown questions on auditory discrimination/visual discrimination.
   - If we had an early childhood endorsement in Oregon, I think it would reflect the curriculum.
   - Generally, it does. The one major exception is the absence of information related to curriculum components stressed by the Oregon State Department of Education. Our professional constituents will expect that background in our graduates.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - Out of the first 50 or so items, distribution among various categories seems to reflect balance. It is within items, not across items, that imbalance appears, with emphasis on social/affect of child development and teacher behavior, rather than cognitive growth or rational adult decision-making.
   - Yes, good balance. However, seemed to be more in art than language areas.
   - Yes. Most of the subject matter areas are covered adequately. Additional questions on recognizing philosophy in action might be appropriate.
   - Yes.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - What a range! On the one hand, some items were so easy the untrained could respond correctly; on the other, students in our doctoral programs might be uncertain. This range is desirable in test construction, I know, but there certainly is some data to suggest this range might be extreme in this test.

- Yes, but in some ways too easy. Maybe?

- Yes. The questions use reasonable vocabulary and the concepts covered are not too difficult.

- Yes.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - Not minority or sex bias; a larger cultural bias that is pro-"family," pro-"female" in the classroom, promoting girl's earlier maturation, etc. Were the items constructed by experts in early childhood education, who also happened to be, in the most cases, females? white? middle-class?

   - No.

   - No.

   - None of major consequence.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - Probably not important, since we don't have that early childhood certification. I would prefer to determine competence for certification on the basis of performance in the classroom/school settings, with children and other professionals in the setting. And this performance measured in terms of what the candidate's program intended to develop in terms of knowledge/skill, mediated by context variables impinging on performance.

   - Yes, with revisions.

   - Yes. I think it might indicate which students could apply what they had learned in classes. It should not be the sole determiner of certification, however. This test can be used for knowledge level assessment but practice in the classroom should also be considered.

   - Absolutely. My impressions of a test's adequacy has been wrong before.

6. Other comments.

   - These tests presume we have a body of knowledge to guide/describe teaching and teacher education; hence, the "right" answer view reflected in content. We do not have such a scientific knowledge base. Emphasis on social development reflected in both individual items and the

large number on test demonstrates societal bias and also bias of test developers (never mind that bias is an accurate mirror of larger society). To summarize, the number of factual or content questions, the types best measured by an objective test, are very limited here.

There are far too many application/evaluation questions where only one answer could be selected, but where the evidence is not sufficient in research to support one answer to exclusion of other.

Regarding item 125: This item in particular reflects a bias with respect to social norms of family life . . . the "correct answer" is not there -- and this tendency to include items like this offends me (all of the options are phrased negatively, even the correct one).

ETS shows an anti-test bias in items included on this test -- how amusing. Someone should tell them you can't have it both ways. All of these remarks should be regarded in view of my own bias, which is not anti-test, but opposed to testing without regard to the curriculum provided in the preparation program and/or in the absence of a large and supporting body of knowledge for a particular point of view.

I also agreed to look at the EC test today because I hoped that doing so would indicate my strong desire to see this become a legitimate certification area in Oregon. The state-driven focus on basic skills/performance, goal-based education leaves little room in elementary education programs for child development courses -- so important for primary teachers. Even if TSPC has "disposed" of the issue of certifying EC teachers, it remains a goal of early educators and teacher educators interested in the primary grades primarily.

- Learning styles of children -- preferred modes, gross and fine motor skills -- again these needs to be broken down in questions. There were several on gross motor. Rather specific in child growth and development ages -- rather than descriptions or expectations.

- The test is considerably longer than necessary to make a judgment about candidate's knowledge.

EDUCATION OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
The Exceptional Child • Psychological problems of exceptionalities other than retarded • Educational problems of exceptionalities other than retarded	10
Theories of Cognition • Theories of learning • Factors influencing the development of intelligence • Theories on educability of intelligence	10
Mental Retardation • Characteristics of mentally retarded • Definitions • Classifications • Etiology • Historical antecedents • Impact of handicapped on the home • Rehabilitation • Research and efficacy studies	40
Assessment: Ability to Use Assessment Data in Planning Appropriate Intervention • Formal testing and evaluation • Teacher-development assistance	15
Delivery of Service Models • Itinerant teaching services • Self-contained programs • Departmentalized programs • Resource room programs • Work-study programs • Consultant services for teachers and parents	10
Curriculum models • Developmental/sequential • Remedial/clinical/diagnostic/prescriptive • Life-skills studies model -- occupational and social skills	15

Methods and Material for Skill Development 40

- Oral language skills
- Academic skills
- Social skills
- Occupational skills
- Physical/motor skills
- Leisure/recreation skills

Professional Concerns 10

- Professional ethics
- Legislation and litigation
- Professional responsibilities

Total Items 150

Grade Levels

The test measures professional knowledge of retarded children of elementary and secondary school years (up to age 21).

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
UO	120	29	1	117	25	8	109	41
WOSC	136	0	10	132	9	9	97	53
PSU	114	8	28	107	16	27	145	5
WOSC	116	34	0	62	81	7	89	61

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Yes.
   - In states where certification is done by category, i.e., mentally retarded, it reflects knowledge level but not demonstrated teaching competence.
   - No. There are two different certifications for Oregon teachers of mentally retarded — handicapped learner and severely handicapped learner. This test stresses curriculum more appropriate to those teachers of mildly handicapped with handicapped learner certification.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - There were more items pertaining to mildly handicapped than severely handicapped.
   - Would prefer heavier weighting on skills necessary to help pupils learn.
   - No. There seems to be an emphasis on intellectual testing and general characteristics of handicapped individuals and vocational education.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Yes.
   - Generally yes.
   - Yes, but the content is very limited.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - No.
   - Use term "parent" instead of "mother."

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - Yes, in conjunction with observation of students demonstrating competency to teach retarded students (if we had categorized certification).
   - No, because the answers for many items are ambiguous. The items need reworking. Also Oregon certification is for severely handicapped or mildly handicapped. The content of the rest is very inappropriate for Oregon students being recommended by severely handicapped learner endorsement!
   - No. The majority of questions focus on mildly handicapped. There is little information on methodology. It is very limited and not very relevant for teachers of severely handicapped.

6. Other comments.

- As one part of an overall evaluation, I see a test of this nature being of value. By no means should a paper and pencil test ever by used as the sole technique of measuring overall teacher competency.

- There is a professional language issue -- terms "mental retardates" and "retardate"s are not currently acceptable. Use instead children/adults who have mental retardation.

- A teacher may easily pass this test by reviewing tests on general characteristics of handicapped, psychological testing, and psychology principles. However, this does not at all evaluate the individual abilities to effectively assess students for program placement, identify appropriate intervention, ability to monitor student progress per objective, and evaluate effectiveness of training. Teachers working with severely handicapped individuals must have practical skills in addition to background information. This is a very limited test and not at all practical for endorsement purposes.

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Program Improvement	52
• Determining needs	
• Curriculum design	
• Instructional improvement	
• Staff evaluation and development	
• Program evaluation	
Management	53
• Business and fiscal features of school management	
• Legal features of school management	
• Governance and control features in school management	
• Organizational and operational features of school management	
Human Relations	45
• Understanding individuals	
• Understanding group dynamics	
• School-community relations	
• Communication skills	
• Creating and maintaining a favorable climate	
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test assesses knowledge of the functions of an administrator or supervisor and of the methods for their implementation. The test is designed for people at the master's level.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
PSU	150	0	0	146	2	2	125	25
UO	—	—	—	48	62	40	47	103
WOSC	89	38	23	82	35	33	92	58
OSU	89	49	12	95	40	15	91	59

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - No, the items mostly test unimportant matters inadequately.
   - Fairly close.
   - Yes and no. Seems "mechanical" with little attention given to the "artistic" or "creative" aspects of administration and supervision.
   - All of the items seem appropriate as being generally representative of our curriculum (or any basic curriculum). The real question is "Are these the best 150 questions to ask? How do we define best and how do we select 150 questions from all of the kinds of possible questions?"

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - The balance is okay -- adequate attention is given to budgeting, school-communication relations, governance, and leadership.
   - Philosophical, historical, and cultural anthroplogical content is missing. There is enough, maybe too much technical stuff. It would be a very long test for an intelligent person who could question.
   - Seems adequate — perhaps too much emphasis on elementary school administration and supervision.
   - More questions in the following areas would seem to improve the test: (1) Leadership — what are the critical attributes of effective educational leadership? (2) Learning and Instruction -- basics of instructional theory, cognitive change, etc. (3) Organizational Research and Theory -- systems theory, conflict management, motivation and theory, change theory, climate research and theory, etc.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Too easy.

- It is mostly difficult because of its restraints. Excellence and parity through standardized exams will not enhance quality. No way!

- Slightly too easy. Many items seem "logical" and do not require direct knowledge.

- Some of the questions appear to be far too simple. Some of the questions appear to be very good in that they require an <u>understanding</u> of the knowledge of administration and supervision. Some of the direct knowledge questions are appropriate also.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - No.

   - Yes, I thought there was. Cronback and I agree. This is personnel selection for political positions and the anomalies will be once again -- excluded. I am a white middle class guy who "made it" -- whatever that means. They won't!

   - None noted.

   - None noticed.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - No. I don't think performance on that test correlates with successful administrative experience.

   - Absolutely not. The test is flawed, it is politically and economically biased and devolutionary. Already some California districts have ceased to use the nationally normed teacher tests. You can get equity, parity, but not excellence. Sure they enhance management but that wrestles everyone to the norm and then below. Qualification and quantification are opposite organizers. Testing, especially nationally normed tests, can create the illusion of improvement and those below the norm can improve. But for these above it, it is devolutionary.

   - Yes. With some test modifications and an interview process.

6. Other comments.

   - I'd rather use something like NASSP Assessment Centers instead of a test like this.

- Given a test of 150 questions, are these the most appropriate 150 questions to ask? Don't find a great deal of fault with most of the questions. They all seem to have some value although some seemed far too simple. The test did not seem to reflect much sense of what the critical knowledge should be for 150 questions. Would also tend to encourage application of knowledge questions. Some of the application of knowledge questions were quite good. How will you decide if the test works? Could not sense much of a pattern or organizing structure for the knowledge and understanding sought through the questions. Would be interested in knowing how the people that did the test organized what was critical for an administrator or supervisor to know.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Literature	67
• Interpretation	
• Analysis	
• Applied literary criticism	
• British, American, World, Ethnic	
• Literary history	
• Recognition (identification)	
• Reference materials, mass media, film	
• Methodology	
Language	23
• Grammar	
• Semantics	
• Language Variation	
• Methodology	
Principles of Writing	60
• Types of writing	
• Organization and development	
• Style	
• Reference materials	
• Methodology	
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test measures basic knowledge and skills for people planning to teach English at the secondary school level.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
WOSC	62	0	88	101	21	28	149	1
WOSC	79	28	43	93	42	15	138	12
UO	62	1	87	63	86	1	146	4

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - For the most part, yes. Some areas are outside the limited range of education students (e.g., Sam Johnson, Don Quixote). Also, some luck is involved -- not all students take drama, for instance, and then not all encounter Ibsen or Beckett.

   - Not necessarily. Most of the test seems to be "name that work;" and though students read a variety of works in our curriculum, there is no guarantee that they have read each of those specified (and there is no necessity for them to!).

   - I was not able to assess this well since I am not familiar with the undergraduate literature courses required at my institution. What students have opportunity to study and what they are required to be familiar with before graduation may not correlate. That could be a real problem.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - This test places extensive emphasis on a wide literary background. If tests like this are going to be required, it is important to have curriculum offering (requiring) the same.

   - No. This test focuses on lower level thinking skills -- recall and comprehensive stuff, and contributes to a fill-in-the-blank mentality. "Subject matter content" in secondary English is arbitrary. The test does not deal with teaching skills or processes at all. The emphasis is on literature (the classics) and the focus is on identification of specific works. (Argh.)

   - Pretty much, although skills seem to be limited to grading papers and commenting on them. But then, how does one test the ability to get at what a poem means.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - This would depend upon cut-off score, of course. I would expect our students to be able to handle it.

- Not an appropriate question. Difficulty level of the test is irrelevant if I disagree with the appropriateness of the test, i.e., what it means and how it measures it (and what is left out).

- I would judge that this test would be difficult for most students. Hunch is that much of what is assessed in the literary area comes as a result of self-selection in reading and course electives.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - #71 — too dictated by dialectical differences.

   - #118 -- rather than "are defined" should be "have traditionally been defined" and also "fortunately this is changing." (Implies acceptance of premise.)

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - No. This test doesn't "measure" those things that really matter. Identifying specific works and grammatical errors is one thing; being able to use language effectively and help students to improve their reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills is another. This kind of test encourages a focus on the lowest common denominator (memorization and recall).

   - I believe students should be given the test to determine whether what is required, what is offered, what is learned, and what is needed sufficiently match what is taught and tested.

   - No. I am fundamentally opposed to standardized tests. I know a lost cause. If some such animal is needed, this would be adequate.

6. Other comments.

   - Some questions are dubious -- is identifying a picture from a work of literature intended to test if a student has read the book or looked at the illustration? Again, the movie skills. Are you testing for knowledge of a work, film and literature, or common sense?

   - I was invited to review the test because of my familiarity with public school curricula. When I marked "uncertain" under "Importance" it was because I judged that it was needed in a very specific area, i.e., for an advanced literature class or a specialty course elected by students. My "no's" reflected awareness that these areas are consciously avoided in school curricula.

FRENCH

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Listening Comprehension • Single utterances (questions and statements) • Short conversations • Longer selections	30
Reading Comprehension	30
Written Expression • Structure • Style	40
Language Learning Problems	40
Cultural Background	40
Total Items	180

Grade Levels

The test is designed to measure competence in teaching French.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
WOSC	All	0	0	175		5	Not Rated Item-by-Item	

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - In general, yes.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - No.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - I would use part of it because I find some questions too detailed or nonpractical and they do not necessarily show a lack of knowledge. I would most certainly add an oral proficiency test and eliminate the listening part of the test.

6. Other comments.

   - I feel that an oral proficiency test should be added to this exam because I feel that it is absolutely necessary to give a complete image of the teacher. The speaking part is not included in this test and for a foreign language teacher, it is a must to be tested on this level.

GERMAN

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Listening Comprehension • Single utterances (questions and statements) • Short conversations • Longer selections	35
Reading Comprehension	30
Structure and Written Expression • Paragraph completion • Error recognition	30
Language Analysis	25
Cultural Background	40
Total Items	160

Grade Levels

The test measures competence in teaching German.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
WOSC	131	13	16	115	27	18	122	38

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - The test could include more of part 3B and also more phonetic/phonemic analysis (part 4). Could stay away from generalizations. Comprehension part is insufficient.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

- Comprehension part should be totally re-thought. I would like to see an oral exam (i.e., ACTFL) where levels of speaking and comprehension can be tested.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Some of "listening comprehension" does not test comprehension, but being able to listen and remember fact(s).

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - Not really, since European culture is still somewhat different than ours.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - Some part of this test, yes! The test as a whole, no! This test does not correctly identify what the student has really learned; many choices in the answers are confusing.

GUIDANCE COUNSELOR

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Counseling	78
• Individual and dyadic counseling	
• Group counseling	
• Diagnosing and appraising needs and problems	
• Written and oral communication	
• Cross cultural communication	
Consulting	38
• Teaching and providing information	
• Analyzing curricula	
• Consulting with other professionals and community	
• Developing community resources	
Coordinating	23
• Managing and organizing time, activities, records	
• Evaluating programs and conducting research	
• Obtaining records	
Professional	16
• Knowledge of legal applications	
• Professional development	
• Knowledge of ethical applications	
Total Items	155

Grade Levels

The test is intended for people completing master's level programs for guidance counselors and who plan to become school counselors. Although the test is directed primarily at the secondary level, it contains questions applicable to all levels.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
OSU	An item-by-item analysis didn't seem appropriate for the test. It was not possible to evaluate technical adequacy from a script (provided for review in lieu of cassette tape used in a real test situation).							

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

    - Extremely heavy emphasis on secondary school level career guidance. This is not consistent with current curriculum nor increasing use of career education teachers. Too little test emphasis on shifting focus of counseling to mental health-related issues. Mostly high school focus. Only a few items are aimed at middle school and elementary counselors.

    - Test reflects strong bias toward traditional high school, vocational, and career-oriented guidance counselor.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

    - There are diverse approaches to counseling and guidance field. Test seems to presuppose right or correct responses without regard to this. Many seemingly wrong responses may be entirely justifiable. This does not seem to be addressed very often in the test.

    - Few, if any, items on recognizing psychopathology or other extreme disorders. Little on consultation with other agencies.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

    - No problem here. Some items appear biased in terms of certain theoretical orientations. Some items ask respondent to choose from among poor choices, other items require choice from among equally valid responses.

    - A person traditionally and well-trained should do well. Someone well trained for more counselor/mental health specialist wil probably not do as well.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

    - Heavy emphasis on Black American minority. Far less on Hispanic, Native, or Asian Americans. These questions seem to be rather heavy handed to be certain they're visible. Real issues are often more subtle than this.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - Yes but I have serious reservations as to this test reflecting current counseling knowledge and practices. I would like to see cross validation with practicing counselors in the field. How are scores reported? What (if any) are the subscales? The test is measuring complex rather than uni-dimensional factors. Determining passing scores needs to consider the role of the counselor defined in this state.

6. Other comments.

   - I suggest alternative tests such as that given by the National Board of Certified Counselors, as an acceptable alternative to this test.

   - I like ETS's attempt to use tapes to test listening. It seems to assume that listening only involves auditory factors. This discriminates against visual processors. I suggest videotaped samples to be more valid tests of listening abilities.

HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
The Family and Human Development	23
• The life cycle	
• Family structures and functions	
Management	23
• Management theory	
• Management techniques	
Consumerism	22
• Rights and responsibilities: legal and ethical	
• Marketing practices	
• Resources	
Nutrition and Foods	22
• Nutrition	
• Menu planning and food services	
Clothing and Textiles	15
• Wardrobe management	
• Textiles	
Housing	15
• Structural types	
• Types of acquisitions	
Home Economics Education	30
• Philosophy	
• Methods and resources	
• Program planning	
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test measures knowledge of home economics and the methodology for teaching the subject.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
OSU	138	0	12	141	2	7	127	23
OSU	132	0	18	133	0	17	123	27

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

    - Yes, but qualified as follows: More questions are included than as needed on home buying vs. other housing choices. Not many questions are included on clothing related to construction. Other areas appear adequately covered for this type of exam.

    - Seemed heavy on housing, otherwise seems to reflect the curriculum.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

    - Balance is probably pretty good.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

    - Some seemed very elementary. However, there is probably a good balance in terms of difficulty.

    - Some seem very elementary.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

    - Item 45 — young women.

    - Item 45 — sexist.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

    - No. If our students have gone through our programs and graduated, they have gained the knowledge for which this particular test is designed. It would be an unnecessary addendum to these students' educational experiences.

    - No. But it might imply that OSSHE does maintain standards and it might be appropriate to use to determine if GPA (in academic area) is high enough to insure teachers have adequate subject matter background.

INDUSTRIAL ARTS EDUCATION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Professional Components	
Program Development and Management	30
• Philosophy	
• Program planning	
• Program implementation	
• Evaluation	
Professionalism and Professional Growth	6
• Participation in professional associations	
• Participation in continuing education	
• Utilization of current professional/technical literature	
Technical Component	
Communications (graphics arts, electricity/electronics photography)	30
• Graphic	
• Electronic	
• Other areas of communication — includes light or acoustics	
Construction (carpentry, masonry, house wiring, plumbing, heating, air conditioning)	21
• Construction inputs	
• Managerial processes	
• Construction/production processes	
• Construction outputs	
Manufacturing (woods, metals, plastics, ceramics, crafts)	32
• Manufacturing inputs	
• Managerial processes	
• Transformation processes	
• Manufacturing outputs	
Transportation/Power/Energy (auto mechanics, small engines, power mechanics, alternate energy)	21
• Transportation media	
• Energy sources	
• Technical systems	
• Transportation systems	
• Servicing	
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test is designed the competence of people who plan to teach industrial arts in grades 7 - 12.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
OSU	98	34	18	89	35	26	86	64

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Generally so.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - There is adequate balance. This is difficult to assess — was a 10 on this side and 10 on the other -- subject matter and professional knowledge not equal.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Did not find questions difficult. Rather found some questions easy, e.g., question #8.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - None noted.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - It would be one added test on a more representative population.

INTRODUCTION TO THE TEACHING OF READING

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Nature of the Reading Process • Interrelationships of the processes of listening, speaking, reading, writing • Environmental factors that influence desire and ability to learn to read	8
Reading Skills and Methods of Teaching Them • Word recognition and analysis • Vocabulary and concept development • Linguistic analysis • Comprehension • Flexibility in reading rates • Study techniques in content fields • Library and reference technique • Oral reading	67
Use of Diagnostic and Prescriptive Teaching to Provide for Individual Differences • Using tests, records and skills profiles in planning instruction • Organizing classroom for various kinds of learning • Using skillful questioning techniques • Knowing pupil characteristics as related to reading • Differentiating reading assignments	30
Theories of Reading Instruction • Focus on students' language, maturity, interest • Focus on nature of English spelling patterns, basic sight words and syntax • Learning theory	9
Reading Instructional Approaches • Changed orthography • Analytic and synthetic phonics • Linguistic approaches • Systems such as programmed reading and individually prescribed instruction • Language experience • Basal reading • Individualized reading	15
School Organization for Teaching Reading • Non-graded and cross-grade grouping • Team teaching • Open classrooms	6

- Use of paraprofessional aides
- Schoolwide approach
- Tutoring

Affective Aspects of Reading Instruction 15
- Stimulation of pupil interest
- Teacher characteristics affecting reading instruction

Teacher Resources
- Professional organizations and journals
- Texts and other sources

Total Items 150

Grade Levels

The test measures knowledge of basic subject matter and methods applicable to field of reading instruction. The test reflects what may be included in an introductory course on the teaching of reading offered to all prospective teachers (K-12), and is used for people who major in any area.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
WOSC	97	12	41	128	10	12	141	9
OSU	102	18	30	101	21	28	106	44
WOSC	125	19	6	114	30	6	102	48

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

- Partially. Students could understand concepts and still respond inadequately. Some questions are simply not sound; others present jargon or get at information through a back door approach. I understand that answers shouldn't be obvious, but I sometimes had to deduce an answer by the process of eliminating totally wrong answers only to end up with one "sort of right" response.

- It gets very specific in some areas, but does little with assessment, phonics content, and generic teaching strategies.

- Yes. It "reflects" the curriculum but it assumes specifics within it -- agreements about effective reading instruction that I don't feel exist.

- Yes, for the most part.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

- Very little on word identification skills and I find even experienced teachers have limited knowledge. Test seems quite traditional, e.g., nothing about integration or the reading/writing connection.
- Yes, but I'm uncertain of the need to include reading comprehension items per se.
- Test seems to omit certain areas such as material selection.
- Items assessing the reading competence of the test taker seemed inappropriate at times. Can "readers" teach "reading?" That isn't enough.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

- There are individual items that seemed to relate to teaching competence generally — not reading specifically. Perhaps that is part of NTE's philosophy however.
- I wouldn't want to take it. Outguessing the key would be very difficult. Our students are taught . . . "It depends!" Not do it this way.
- Yes.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

- "His" children.
- No.
- No, if items reflecting philosophical bias were remembered.
- o No.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

- Yes. Need some base line data and item analysis with actual students before this becomes etched in stone.
- No. The testing we do in the program is adequate for determining content and skill mastery. Another "level" of testing is not at all necessary.

- No. Only if all items reflecting philosophical bias were removed.

- No. I don't feel results would yield important information about their knowledge and skills.

6. Other comments.

- I would hate to think this test determined those who could and couldn't teach. Some items are fine; we teach most of the content. But we teach much more. Work in classrooms concurrent with "book learning" is essential. The sum total simply doesn't add up to someone who does or doesn't know how to teach reading.

- This test seems to reflect a philosophical bias about teaching of reading, including items that indicate there is <u>one</u> correct way to respond to situations. I would be <u>very</u> concerned if my students consistently identified specific responses to some items. The nature of the teaching of reading often leads one to try a variety of techniques rather than one standard response. Actually, that last statement is only part of the philosophical disagreement in this area.

LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Organization and Administration of the Library Media Center • Assessing needs • Planning • Formulating budgets • Supervising and training personnel • Evaluating programs and procedures for selection and circulation of resources • Establishing policies and procedures for selection and circulation of resources • Scheduling use of facilities and equipment • Planning new facilities and utilizing existing space • Using computers/technology for library media center management	35
Selection, Acquisition, and Organization of Resources • Selecting resources • Acquiring resources • Organizing resources • Maintaining resources	38
Information Sources and Services • Knowledge of reference tools and their uses • Clarification of user questions • Awareness of other resources such as public libraries, businesses and community resources • Use of data bases to locate and retrieve information	29
Instructional Services • Participate in design/development of curriculum • Assist in selection and use of appropriate media to achieve specific instructional objectives • Prepare guides, bibliographies • Apply instructional design principles in production of materials • Produce nonprint materials such as transparencies, graphics, audio-visual materials • Teach library media skills • Teach the use of library media resources including research strategies • Promote use of library media center • Use computer and technology in instructional program	36
Professional Development • Awareness of role/function of professional organizations and state and federal agencies	12

- Identification and interpretation of relevant state and federal legislation (e.g., copyrights, ECIA)
- Familiarity with professional literature
- Trends and issues

Total Items 150

Grade Levels

The test measures the knowledge and abilities of people trained in school librarianship and audio-visual services for either elementary or high school level. The test is appropriate for people in either the bachelor's or master's programs.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
WOSC	110	27	3	126	23	1	102	48
OSU	91	4	54	109	6	35	50	90
PSU	122	10	18	122	13	14	77	73

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - In many cases, questions are assessing indepth knowledge level.
   - Does not include new microcomputer resource as an instructional and management tool.
   - If students take this in lieu of the curriculum for the endorsement program, what does this question mean? It completely omits the practicum component of the curriculum, is weak in literature, and has no provision for testing production and equipment operation skills. Also weak in identification of library media skills.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - It does not reflect the specialized knowledge of reference works required nor an accurate knowledge of literature.
   - Most of the questions relate to library skills of print

materials and not to nonprint media. Definitely library oriented.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Yes, as far as the material it covers. However, the possibility of so many correct answers on questions is very confusing.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - Okay.
   - None noted.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - No. I'm not sure it addresses the right kinds of questions.
   - No. If we are to test students for endorsement then we need to test all areas including practical applications.
   - No. Too many vague questions — instructional variables cause many situations to change.

6. Other comments.

   - I do not have extensive background in traditional library science courses. Had very little knowledge on answering those questions.
   - This was difficult to evaluate without knowing the "correct" answers. Many questions seemed to have more than one possibility. This test bothers me — it seems to imply that there is one best philosophy of media center development, management, and implementation.
   - Many of the policy questions can only be answered in terms of the individual school population or policy — a blanket statement is inaccurate (i.e., #29, #30, and others). I am concerned that many of the questions have many possible correct answers. I am not sure that we can mandate the same philosophy of all library media specialists. Yet I think this test requires just that. It is difficult to determine the technical accuracy when one does not know the answer that the testing service will accept.

MATHEMATICS

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Number Concepts, Elementary Number Theory	12-15
Elementary and Intermediate Algebra	17-21
Geometry, including Euclidean, solid, coordinate and transformational	20-22
Functions and Their Graphs, including algebraic, trigonometic, logarithmic, exponential	18
Counting Problems, Probability and Statistics	6-7
Alebraic Topics -- structural systems, abstract and linear algebra	9-12
Limits, Calculus, Properties of Real Numbers	6-7
Other Topics: Measurement, Computer Science, Finite Mathematics, History of Mathematics	12-15
Professional Knowledge	5-11
Total Items	120

Grade Levels

The test measures mathematical knowledge and abilities of people who plan to teach mathematics at the secondary level.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
OSU	97	0	3	88	3	29	108	12
UO	105	1	14	90	13	17	86	27
PSU	100	1	18	101	2	16	101	15

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - No. This is a good test of the high school curriculum. I would guess that our top-ranked high school seniors taking calculus would do well on this test. Some of the questions would probably not be covered at the college level at all. The ones that do relate to "post-calculus topics" are generally very rudimentary. This test does not reflect the current mathematics requirements of most programs in the state. Note: In most programs, history of math is not currently a requirement, and while some of us wish history were adequately covered in our mathematics courses, it isn't necessary.

   - No -- Do not use this test! The mathematical level of the content questions is that of the high school curriculum. The test does not attempt to get at the depth of mathematical background required to teach the curriculum with understanding. Many of the content questions would be seen as too easy by a junior high student.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - The pedagogy questions are a mixed bag. Some aren't too bad. Others (#113, 112, 60, 29, 26, and to some extent #115, 114, 104, 90, and 9) deal with irrelevancies such as activities of professional societies. It would be outrageous to deny certification to a person who just missed these questions. It would be equally outrageous to pass a person who got these right but missed a corresponding number of content questions. The pedagogy questions as a whole are inappropriate to the purpose of the test. Moreover, they range over the whole K-12 spectrum.

   - Most of the questions relate to precalculus and calculus. Many of our students come to us with that preparation from high school. Hence it is not reflective of what they study in college. Some questions are -- but not the preponderance.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - A good challenging test for bright high school graduates.

   - Lord no! See #1 above.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - No.
   - None apparent.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - No. A waste of time. This is not the test for us.
   - No, for the reasons listed in previous questions, it wouldn't be bad to have students take such a test, but it definitely should not be used as a substitute for course work. Otherwise it establishes a totally different level of requirement for a mathematics endorsement.

6. Other comments.

   - Our curriculum contains a full year of abstract algebra, two terms of geometry, and one term each of logic, set theory, linear algebra and number theory, in addition to lower-division material. We have these courses in the program because we are convinced that they are needed to give teachers adequate background in and appreciation for the main ideas of mathematics. The coverage of all of these topics on this test is superficial at best. Questions typically ask if the examinee knows the meaning of some basic definition, not whether he or she is capable of solving problems in the subject. It is possible that part of the advanced math GRE could be used to test what we want. But this is not the test for Oregon.
   - This test may be appropriate for people who want to obtain a Basic Combined Mathematics Endorsement; but only if they also are knowledgeable about elementary level mathematics and methods of teaching elementary and remedial students.
   - Since many of these guidelines cover high shool level material, the students in many cases would already have learned this is high school and so would <u>not</u> be taking courses covering the material in college.

MUSIC EDUCATION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Basic Musicianship	90
• History of all periods with major emphasis on 18th-20th centuries	
• Theory	
Curriculum and Instruction	45
• Course offerings at various levels	
• Course content including scope, sequence, performance skills, and interdisciplinary aspects	
• Pedagogical approaches	
• Materials and equipment	
Professional Information	15
• Psychology and philosophy of music education	
• Professional literature such as journals, reference works, source materials	
• Professional practices and ethics	
• Professional organizations	
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test is designed to measure understanding of basic content of undergraduate music courses with relation to the teaching of music. Approximately one-third of the test is based on taped excerpts.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
UO	120	0	30	100	17	33	134	16
WOSC	141	0	9	128	14	5	140	7
OSU	145	3	2	138	11	0	117	33
WOSC	133	0	17	127	0	23	134	10

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   • Probably not.

- The test is comprehensive in that it covers K-12 and has questions from history, orchestration, music education, and so forth.

- Yes — See #3.

- Yes. More methodology needs to be included.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

    - Generally yes. An opportunity to exhibit hands on ability, or recognition of ability (or lack of) in video taped demonstration should be included in the examination.

    - Balance is okay but the skills "necessary in helping pupils to comprehend" — are really not addressed. For example, being able to select the right conducting pattern in this test is a far cry from demonstrating the conducting skills required for teaching effectiveness.

    - Leans heavily on music history. Weak in "methodology" type questions.

    - No. More listening-related chorus, bands, and orchestras needed.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

    - Usually. Some of the earlier-music listening and written questions may not be.

    - Some historical questions are extremely fine pointed -- would these contribute toward a better teacher in the classroom?

    - Very comprehensive test -- includes band, orchestra, choral, and elementary general music. Most students will be weak in at least one area. All topics cannot be covered in four years.

    - Some items require more esoteric answers than required for teaching. For example, does a teacher really need to discriminate between various composers?

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

- Didn't spot any.
- No.
- None.
- No.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

- I would not object to having this test given to our music education majors prior to graduation. I am not sure, however, that it should be required just yet. It would give us valuable feedback as to strengths and weaknesses of our program.
- Only if a practical demonstration of classroom competence is built into the test or has been fully demonstrated through the student teaching experience as part of a degree requirement.
- No, for the following reasons: (1) The skills needed for success in teaching are not effectively addressed. "Textbook answers" on conducting, the changing voice, intonation and tone production do not demonstrate the abilities needed in the classroom. (2) Some knowledge called for is too sophisticated and irrelevent. Being able to recognize the style of major composers and major periods is good enough. Secondary composers and periods goes further than needed.
- Yes, as long as student teaching is required or a practical exam of some sort is needed to examine abilities to conduct, tune, and work with elementary level music classes.

6. Other comments.

- It would indeed be rare for a non-music student to pass this exam. Am glad it contains "aural" perception questions (tape).
- Would suggest that these candidates be sent to our institution where they can take the exams given to our students before student teaching and the history and theory exams required for entrance to the master's program.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
History and Philosophy of Physical Education • Historical foundations • Philosophical foundations • Aims and general objectives • Trends	12
Scientific Foundations • Psychological • Sociological • Biological • Growth and Development	38
Curriculum Development and Planning • Identification of students' interests, needs and characteristics • Establishment of performance and behavioral objectives • Criteria for selecting activities • Programs • Instructional strategies • Activities including aquatics; body conditioning; movement exploration; dance and rhythmic activities; games and relays; gymnastics; individual, dual and team sports; leisure activities; martial arts	45
Organization and Administration of the Total Program • Basic instructional programs, including use of personnel, budgets, schedules, facilities, equipment and materials • Health and safety • Public relations • Working with the handicapped	33
Professional Responsibilities	7
Evaluation • Values and purposes • Selection, construction, use of instruments unique to objectives • Assessment of individual achievement • Assessment of program effectiveness • Assessment for individualized programs, especially for handicapped	15
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test is designed for people who plan to teach physical education at any grade level from kindergarten through grade 12.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
OSU	89	3	55	62	38	35	80	49
UO	124	8	6	109	7	12	88	20
PSU	142	0	8	113	16	21	132	7

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Specific questions about individual sports skills should not be included -- when concepts overlap many sports -- okay. Example, #29.

   - Yes, if K-12. But there is a need to separate elementary PE from middle school PE from high school PE. Programs differ and students differ. Questions should differ.

   - No. There are a number of specific examples is professional activity. It would be better to emphasize concepts which are generally applied to the kinesiological/psychological areas. Why is it necessary to include coaching with physical education instruction?

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - No. Excessive involvement with current issues; PL 94-142, Title 9 are examples.

   - The following topics are covered: health/physiology of exercise, kinesiology, strategies/methods, curricular/administration, physical fitness, anatomy, growth and development, tests and measurements, professional organization, psychosocial, legal liability. However, this test needs more questions covering aspects of specific sport, dance, and exercise forms found in the public schools.

   - Seems to be a void on objectives of physical education and specific types of skill tests. Nothing on training regimens for conditioning. Needs questions on kinetics

and muscular actions in sport. Needs something on lesson planning.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Yes, terminology is appropriate.
   - Yes.
   - It is an exam that should be considered minimum difficulty for the average student.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - No.
   - No.
   - None noticed.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - It is too bad that the decision has already been made to include this exam as a screening device. Why were university departments responsible for training/certifying students not allowed to collectively provide feedback prior to the decision?
   - I don't know -- would like to sample our students.
   - No opinion. Would like to discuss with faculty.

6. Other comments.

   - The area of curriculum development is limited -- program design, types of activities, time requirement based on growth and development needs. More on teaching methods.
   - Mixing coaching (athletics) and physical education questions may not be a good idea. (We do not have a coaching certification in Oregon.) Some questions refer to health education -- again this is a separate certification in Oregon. Our use of a test must be in agreement with TSPC certification.
   - I am not in favor of any standardized examination, particularly as a method of enabling already certified personnel to receive a second teaching specialization.

READING SPECIALIST

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Language Foundations for Reading • English language as a communication system • Language development	15
Comprehension • Understanding literal and interpretive comprehension processes and their application to materials and daily tasks • Understanding nature of critical comprehension processes and teaching students to evaluate and analyze material • Knowing how to teach reference and study skills	30
Word Analysis • Knowledge of interrelation of word analysis skills and comprehension skills • Knowledge of word analysis strategies • Knowledge of ways to stimulate mastery of word analysis skills	20
Enjoyment of Reading • Knowledge of appropriate materials for students at all levels • Ability to analyze students' needs and suggest books to meet those needs • Knowledge of ways to stimulate desire to read and share stimulating reading experiences	20
Diagnostic Teaching • Diagnostic evaluation • Organization of the school and classroom for diagnostic teaching • Adaptation of instruction to needs of students with varied linguistic backgrounds • Instruction of students with special reading needs	45
Program Planning and Improvement • Interacting with parents and community • Instructional planning • Initiating improvement for and with individuals and groups; current professional developments' conducting inservice programs on reading instruction; functioning as a resource person	20
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test measures knowledge of methods and materials needed for teaching and supervising reading. It is intended for people with master's degree or comparable training who plan to either teach reading at any grade level (K-12) or to supervise teachers of reading, or to assume related positions such as reading clinician, coordinator, resource person, or specialist.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
PSU	119	24	2	112	33	0	61	81
OSU	133	15	0	123	24	1	100	50
UO	132	1	13	133	1	13	111	36

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - The test assumes that students in a Specialist Program are graduate students with some inservice experience. This is not true in Oregon as the Basic-Reading Endorsement is an undergraduate and/or graduate program. Inservice is not a prerequisite.
   - In general, yes.
   - Not enough attention to professional judgment and circumstances. We do not teach bits of knowledge that are alway/usually right or wrong. We stress the interrelationships or a number of factors.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - No. Language and vocabulary -- purposes for learning are not sufficiently well represented.
   - Little evidence that teachers could demonstrate needed competencies. There should be more on test terminology and use.
   - Oregon Reading Endorsement is K-12. There are not an adequate number of questions concerning content area reading -- developmental and corrective reading or secondary levels.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Yes, if they had minimum of two years inservice before they took Specialist Training.
   - Some questions are trivial. A few would be very hard.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - No. Many questions used in this test are based on national sample. Reading Education programs tend to cover areas as the faculty perceives the need of the local scene.
   - No. There is not sufficient agreement among respected professionals concerning knowledge. It is related to values. Tests like this have little transfer value to professional tasks.

6. Other comments.

   - There must be better ways of testing professional knowledge than this. You can psych. out the answers that the testers expect in most cases, but it is a serious mistake to think that a right answer here would always apply in a classroom. The questions posed are frequently over-simplifications of what really happens in classrooms. Most of the topics are important. Most are within the experience of our students. I suppose we have to get by with tests like this because they are quick and cheap. So many "right answers" while right, unless applied to the right context or used in an appropriate degree, would not be right in all cases. The context supplied by the questions is not sufficient.
   - Many distractors are not consistent with current research. Many questions do not reflect current research findings even with an '85 copyright date. Many questions are too narrow and related to specifics that may or may not be covered in any given program. Very poorly constructed test.
   - As in the Introduction to Reading test, this one continues to assess knowledge of particular reading programs instead of the theory underlying them. Texts for teachers seldom mention various programs by name any more. Too many

questions suggest simplistic answers. There often is not a first, a best, etc., but rather, the teacher needs to know a variety of ways to deal with a problem. It isn't enough to recognize a solution; teachers must be able to generate and implement a solution. I'm concerned in this and the Introduction test that teachers are not held responsible for ways to teach comprehension. Durkin found that teachers usually tested, rather than taught comprehension. I found nothing here to change that. Teaching reading is a complex process. Perhaps the ramifications of that statement are too great for a single test.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Professional Education • Conceptual approaches to social studies instruction • Inquiry strategies • Questioning techniques • Evaluation • Curriculum planning	35
Political Science • Application of general political concepts	20
Economics • Basic concepts of microeconomics and macroeconomics applied to problems/issues in public and private sectors	12
History • Social and political history of U.S. and its minority groups, Western civilization, Third World (Africa, Asia, Latin America)	43
Geography • World geography and cultural concepts	10
Sociology/Anthropology/Psychology • Social issues • Human relations • Urban anthropology • Ethnicity	30
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test covers the range of subject matter and abilities considered basic for teaching history and the social sciences in secondary schools.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
WOSC	96	18	36	—	—	—	—	—
UO	147	0	3	145	0	5	134	16

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

    - Not totally. The heavy ethnocentric emphasis on U.S. and European history substantially ignores the shifting focus toward Caribbean, Latin America, and Asian relationships with the U.S.

    - Not adequately -- seems preponderantly history and political science. There is more to social studies! It is difficult to tell whether it reflects curriculum because curriculum contains so many options and tracks!

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

    - Pretty short on "skills necessary in helping pupils," etc.

    - The emphasis on "facts" is too heavy and the response choices on teaching strategies are too narrow and absolute as compared with the "real world" of teaching.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

    - In terms of content/fact knowledge . . . it's fine. Our program essentially covers all of the areas of the test.

    - Yes.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

    - Asian, Hispanic, and Native American references seem to be totally absent. Only narrow focus on Blacks.

    - No.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

    - No. It's an inadequate reflection of fitness to teach social studies. If certification were for history, I would feel differently.

    - No. I do not believe that this test offers an adequate measure for certification in social studies. I see little

correlation between the test and quality teachers (and the literature seems to support the notion that tests are not an adequate measure of predicting who will become good teachers)!

6. Other comments.

- Some of the terminology is regional, i.e., ideology/mores when discussing culture. Geography and anthropology seem to be ignored -- perhaps valid since in Oregon, social studies is essentially history.

- Reconsider the questions in developing nations -- a number of the questions are clearly biased. The questions on teaching strategies are narrow and stilted. The racial representation is narrow, so too the representation of women. While factual knowledge is certainly important and necessary for teaching social studies, I do not believe this test is a valid measure of competence in social studies instruction.

SPANISH

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Listening Comprehension • Single utterances (questions and statements) • Short conversations • Longer selections	35
Reading Comprehension	30
Structure and Written Expression • Paragraph completion • Error recognition	30
Language Analysis	25
Cultural Background	40
Total Items	160

Grade Levels

The test measures competence in teaching Spanish.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
WOSC	144	0	16	125	1	34	137	23

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - To some extent. They are exposed to nearly every bit of it, and much, much more. But who cares if they recall the trivia? Much of the latter is of a lower-than-college or university level and rather insignificant.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

- Not at all (though the above question is hard to answer, being gibberish in linguistic, logical, and structural terms). Any (semi-)native speaker would intuit (at least) most of the correct answers from Section 1 and perhaps the "cultural" part of the test (Section 5). Any English speaker who had read of Hispanic culture could do well on the "Trivia Game" of Section 5 (some highly valuable, others strictly "who cares?").

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Section 2 would be a "giveaway" for most (semi-)native speakers, perhaps of significant difficulty for others; unfair advantage, but maybe inevitable. I see about five (almost totally inane, most of them) "questions" on literature and the "cultural" materials are often the "cutesy" stuff easily mastered in grade school.

     Literatures and cultural readings (by outstanding cultural essayists, e.g., interpretive) are college-level. A foreign language on "communication" level, a few dates and names of dances, glib mention of who belonged to what literary era -- all can be mastered by anyone on the street, through training, not education. This is a high school level test except for parts 3 and 4 and bits and pieces elsewhere.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - Yes. Why select some "fiesta days," Catholic customs, parades of interest to tourists with Kodaks, etc., and neglect other aspects of culture less superficial and more generally Hispanic?

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - See other comments.

SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
Interpersonal Communication • Communication as process • Development of communication competence • Verbal and nonverbal codes and functions • Perception of self and others • Empathic listening • Interpersonal goals, strategies, outcomes • Intercultural communication	25
Small Group Communication • Group dynamics • Communication contexts	20
Public Speaking • Purposes, types and forms • Audience analysis • Organizing structures • Rhetorical strategies • Language and style • Delivery • Listening, feedback, adaptation to audience • Criticism and evaluation of speeches • Speech confidence and anxiety • Other modes of public communication	25
Mass Communication (television, film, radio) • Theory, critical analysis, evaluation • Social and technological influences and effects • Production techniques	15
Play Production • Dramatic theory and criticism • Acting • Directing • Design and construction • Theatre management	20
Oral Interpretation (readers' theatre, chamber theatre and creative dramatics) • Aesthetic principles • Analysis • Performance techniques	20
Forensics — Classroom and Co-Curricular Instruction • Argumentation and debate (including persuasion) • Individual events	15

Professional Concerns 10

- Communication rights, freedoms, responsibilities, laws
- Organization and management of co-curricular programs
- Professional organizations
- Print and nonprint resources
- Assessment and evaluation issues

Total Items 150

Grade Levels

The test measures competence in speech communications.

Faculty Ratings

	"Opportunity"			"Importance"			"Technical Adequacy"	
	Yes	No	Uncertain	Yes	No	Uncertain	Adequate	Inadequate
WOSC	42	98	1	38	106	1	131	19
WOSC	123	22	5	116	16	22	121	29
UO	134	1	15	116	2	32	119	31

Faculty Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Probably -- except on oral interpretation. A bit outdated.
   - It would be a very poor reflection of the components of the certification requirements in acting and technical theatre. Only three questions come close to dealing with teaching theatre and those aren't even close ones.
   - At some institutions in Oregon, students in speech communications would not have exposure to classes in theatre. Speech and theatre may be completely separated.

2. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this particular field?

   - There is a good balance between content and skill. My concern is about the lack of practical application of principles. Speech is performance-oriented and not just an awareness of principles.
   - No. This test is directed to speech and oral interpretation with little regard for theatre.

- Long on oral interpretation, short on rhetoric (the foundation of speech communications). Tell ETS to change the balance! Otherwise, it is very dated. 35 of 150 questions are framed in the negative -- excessive -- and because blocked together at end, advantage of this phrasing totally lost. Weak test construction.

3. Does the difficulty level of the test appear to be appropriate for your students?

   - Yes, the difficulty level is appropriate.
   - Yes, okay.
   - No.

4. Any minority or sex bias noted in the test items?

   - No.
   - The bias noted in the test is that it is pro-speech and has few theatre questions at all.
   - No.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

   - Yes, but the practical application has to be considered along with the knowledge of the subject matter.
   - No. Prefer measure of performance on the job, with kids, etc.
   - I certainly would not. A student who passed this test wouldn't indicate he knew anything at all about theatre and answering the few that are here correctly wouldn't indicate a mastery of any of the areas set up by TSPC as necessary for theatre certification.

6. Other comments.

   - Oral interpretation — a bit outdated. Short on rhetoric, long on oral interpretation and mass communication. Drop truly technical questions -- or incorporate more. Test should go one way or the other.
   - Some of the answers that I assume would be considered correct about oral interpretation, readers' theatre, etc., are no longer up with the times. Many, many theatre

elements are now a part of the staging of readers' theatre and chamber theatre. If this sort of test were to be given to theatre people, it would have to be geared to theatre. Speech and theatre are now not directly related as they were 20 years ago. TSPC has made speech and theatre separate as secondary certification areas. That is, a student must have another major area of certification if he is to be certified in a secondary area (speech, journalism, theatre). That means a student is not likely to be certified in both speech and theatre any more -- but in some area such as English or science with secondary certification in either speech or theatre (but not both). Thus an exam that links the two in this manner is inappropriate as a testing device. Also, theatre is a performance area. A student to be able to teach these elements well must demonstrate he has mastered them -- not through multiple choice questions, but by performance proof.

EDUCATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
The Child as the Focus of Teaching • Intellectual development of the child • The nature of the child	101
The Process of Teaching in the Elementary-Middle School • Diagnosis of student needs • Prescriptive teaching • Evaluation of instructional effectiveness • Classroom organization and management for instruction • Foundations/reasons for instructional decision-making	49
Total Items	150

Grade Levels

The test is designed for people preparing to teach in grades 1-8, either the lower elementary grades or the upper elementary-middle school grades. Approximately one-third of the questions are general and unrelated to specific grade levels, one-third relate to primary grades (1-3), and one-third relate to upper elementary-middle school grades (4-8).

Faculty Ratings

Reviewers were from SOSC, OSU, WOSC, EOSC, and UO (2). Not all faculty completed an item-by-item analysis, some preferred to complete open-ended questions only.

Opportunity to Learn		Importance of Knowledge	
Yes	No	Yes	No
141	9	139	11
148	2	135	15
113	37	118	32
127	23	123	27

Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Test generally reflects curriculum of students except for Health Education, which is a highly visible part of the elementary school curriculum in some Oregon schools.

- Many questions represent only one point of view. If this is not the point of view held by a particular institution, students might not get the necessary information in a current curriculum.

- Questions often require knowledge gained above elementary training, e.g., knowledge of gifted, measurement, and learning disabled certification programs. I agree elementary teachers need to know the information but I question if it is included in all elementary teacher training programs across the country.

- The test reflects the curriculum of students who would be taking it. Unavoidably biased in places, but overall it's not too bad.

2. Are there specific questions which are technically inadequate, e.g., questions which contain inaccuracies or ambiguities, questions whose response options do not clearly contain one best answer, etc.?

   - Some questions are technically inaccurate/contain inaccuracies or ambiguities. There may be a best answer but it's not fair to the students/future teachers if the professor they have emphasizes a different point of view.

   - Some questions are technically inadequate and inaccurate. For example, 12 assumes all children's motor skills develop at the same rate; 19 has two possible right answers; in 21, the word "exceptional" could mean gifted as well as learning disabled, thus confusing the reader; 31, answers C and D would both be included in good assessment; 35 ITA a poor choice . . . why not LEA or Basal instead (ITA not used that much here in schools).

   - 7 questions are particularly noted as technically inadequate (13, not any good answer; 142, all answers appropriate; 8?, not clear which is best; 91, dependent on circumstances; 94, confusing answers; 54, depends on circumstances and situation; 79, all answers could help, who is to say which is best?).

   - 20 questions seem to test general knowledge more than specific knowledge of elementary education.

3. Does there appear to be an adequate balance among the questions treating the subject matter content, the skills necessary in helping pupils to comprehend and learn effectively the content, and the unique professional knowledge of this field?

   - Seems like a heavy emphasis on science.

- Questions 1-40 appear well balanced in subject matter. My concern is they require the student to go beyond simple subject matter covered in training programs. A great deal of experiential background, synthesis, and inferences are required.

- I believe the following questions test general knowledge more than the specific knowledge of education: 5, 28, 32, 33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 48, 52, 65, 68, 73, 103, 126, 127, 135, 138, 140.

4. Does the difficulty level appear appropriate for your students?

- The total information required for accurate responses is a bit overwhelming. Skills in test-taking are strongly rewarded. "Good" students can be successful but may not transfer to practice.

- Some of the questions are pretty obvious.

- The test is too difficult. I don't feel that alot of this material is covered in our program.

- Difficulty level is appropriate.

- Difficulty level appears appropriate for the most part. But if that means students should answer 90-100% correctly, than I believe the test is too difficult. Difficulty depends on standard set for passing.

- Readability level in the test is fine. Jargon is kept to necessary level. Distractors require reader to fully understand, even infer, intent of question (i.e., student must be knowledgeable in the areas of cognitive research, developmental psychology, teaching strategies, and available materials).

5. Minority or sex bias noted?

- WASP bias.

- Noted one example of minority or sex bias.

- None noted (N=3).

6. Would you like to use this test with OSSHE students prior to recommendation for certification?

- I would be willing to try it out. It could be used as one criterion. Performance in lab would be another. I don't

have sufficient information to judge cut-off scores, what's right in some instances, without seeing answers. I found myself in a trap. Students do have an opportunity to learn most of the information. It is important information but I could not discriminate between important and essential in all cases.

- Test seems like a "hoop" to jump rather than an indicator of successful teaching. Not sure that 150 questions are necessary to do what the test wants to do.

- Would not recommend using the test. The information could be useful in identifying some appropriate knowledge needed by the elementary teacher but the knowledge is not as important as the evidence through application.

- The test is more endurance than assessment of knowledge. Half the number of questions might be appropriate/best. Overall, the test is not bad — tests general expectations of a well educated elementary candidate.

- I think it would provide a reasonable assessment of a person's professional preparation for teaching. I would see passing this as a minimum standard for certification, not as a substitute for a quality teacher education program which includes extended field experience.

PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE

Specifications

Major Categories Covered	Approximate No. of Items
The Process of Teaching	69
• Planning, objectives, diagnosing needs, identifying resources, and designing instruction	
• Implementing instructional design and conditions that facilitate learning	
• Evaluating student achievement and instructional effectiveness	
The Context of Teaching	36
• Recognizing students' constitutional rights and state, federal, and judicial policy and implications of these for classroom practice	
• Recognizing extraclassroom influences on teachers and students, including school policy, community expectations, media, and children's developmental patterns	
• Demonstrating knowledge of teaching profession and of professional teaching behaviors	
Total Items	105

Grade Levels

The test focuses on the knowledge and skills a beginning teacher uses in decision-making, with emphasis on the context and process of teaching. Questions are considered basic to the education of any teacher, regardless of the teacher's particular training, grade level focus, or subject matter specialty.

Faculty Ratings

Faculty reviewers were from UO (2), SOSC, OSU (2), PSU (2), WOSC (2), and EOSC. Not all faculty reviewed each of the sections in an item-by-item manner. Some elected to complete the open-ended questions that follow.

	Opportunity to Learn		Importance of Knowledge	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Section 1	28	7	26	9
	14	21	14	21
	35	0	35	0
	30	5	34	1
	34	1	26	9

	31	4	31	4
	27	8	23	12
	29	6	24	11
	34	1	35	0
	30	5	19	16
Section 2	14	21	15	22
	19	16	26	9
	25	10	26	9
	23	12	33	8
	32	3	27	8
	32	3	28	7
	27	8	28	7
	35	0	35	0
	31	4	29	6
Section 3	30	5	24	11
	27	8	33	2
	32	3	24	11
	10	25	10	25
	30	5	23	12
	22	13	27	8
	26	9	29	6
	25	10	23	12

Comments

1. Does the test reflect the curriculum of students who would be taking it?

   - Somewhat. Heavy emphasis on legal aspects; overemphasis at the expense of learning and how it takes place. Same with 94-142 and cultural diversity. They are important areas but are they top priority? What about foundations?
   - Yes (N=3).
   - Generally. Many items are vague or dependent upon which teacher(s) a student might have.
   - Very difficult to determine.
   - In a general way, yes. But there can be an unevenness of content as students transfer from one school to another and as students take different tracks through individual programs at each school. Another problem is that elementary and secondary teachers may not have the same backgrounds demanded by these items. Our secondary education majors are not required to take Ed462 Exceptional Children at this time. Therefore, they would not have had as much background for the 94142, Special Education focus type questions as the elementary education majors.

- To some degree, yes. There is a large degree of information on the legal and contractual elements of teaching which we do not have time to cover. Tests assume that we cover alot of territory and leave little to be learned on the job.

- It is hard to determine which questions would require retention of specific learnings and which are answered by an application of common sense.

- At our institution we are probably weakest in specific applications of statute to teacher performance.

- The test overemphasizes certain categories of items, underemphasizing implementation and student rights categories. Also tests differ in level of knowledge assessed and type of mental process/reasoning tapped. Regarding our program's curriculum, our students would probably do ok, but not necessarily because of what we teach them.

2. Are there specific questions which are technically inadequate, e.g., questions which contain inaccuracies or ambiguities, questions whose response options do not clearly contain one best answer, etc.?

- Yes, some.

- 4 questions noted as poor items, one of which contains dated information.

- 20 questions noted as poorly worded and ambiguous.

- No.

- Problem with 23.

- The questions are not specific. Words and phrases such as "research, indicates, generalization, likely," etc. in the statements permit selection of a number of responses, anyone of which may be correct.

- 22, 24, 27 and 28.

3. Does the difficulty level appear to be appropriate for your students?

- Seems appropriate for graduating seniors.

- Some of my students may have problems with the level of language, although they may have an intuitive understanding of the issues raised.

- Yes. But there would be considerable difficulty if a freshman, sophomore, or junior would take the test without having completed all the required sequences and student teaching. Even seniors would not complete all of these until their last term.

- Students have all kinds of experience with tests of this nature.

- Some items would "kill" the students while others seem too easy. Many are on target.

- Real variation in levels of difficulty from item to item. Prompts me to inquire about selection of items and also psychometric analyses of items, subtests, and total test. In most cases, the item content is not beyond the level of our students but the vocabulary may be overly sophisticated and weighted with jargon.

- Problem is a beginning teacher (expectations) as opposed to a "master" teacher. Should beginning teachers be master teachers? Many items could be deleted if we had a more realistic set of expectations for a beginning teacher.

- Seems appropriate as an exit test.

- Okay. Of the 3 sections, section III seems more complex and appropriate. Other sections may be too easy.

4. Minority or sex bias noted?

- None noted (N=7).

- Some questions, particularly those in the areas of knowledge requiring professional judgement are value laden; to that extent, these items may discriminate against teachers not conforming to/acculturated to society's dominant values.

5. Would you like to use this test with OSSTE students prior to recommendation for certification?

- Could be used. Might have to have separate tests for elementary and secondary. This professional test might be more elementary-oriented than it is secondary.

- No. I question its reliability and validity in terms of being reflective of good teaching or potential for good teaching.

- I'm not sure that there is an advantage in using the test. It might screen out the very weak though.

- I would prefer that Oregonians work together to identify new and innovative ways to measure teachers' knowledge of content and pedagogy; particularly I would encourage that any paper/pencil test also be accompanied by an assessment experience or field-based.

- It would be nice to show students what is being done in other states. It would be a good home work assignment but I am opposed to additional teacher testing.

- A good check of general professional knowledge and logical thinking. No problems with this if we need yet another test.

- No. I would prefer a combination of both essay and "objective" tests.

- No. I feel that a more mastery based , institutionally tailored evaluation procedure would be more appropriate.

- Not really. I'm not at all sure this test has predictability value in terms of actual skill in front of a class. I believe that two of the four people who I dismissed from student teaching would have passed this test.

- I would like to see empirical data related to performance on the NTE and measured performance of public school students whose teachers have scored well, or poorly, on the examination. What real correlations emerge? Truly, the psychometric issues are critical were we to undertake state-developed test and performance evaluations. But assessment based on program objectives and specific curricular aims is superior to this sort of standardized test. Let's look at subject matter tests next, then make a final stab at test evaluation. Give us some psychometric data, like factor analysis of test.

Appendix A

FACULTY REVIEWERS

Name	Title	Department
University of Oregon		
Ned J. Christensen	Professor and Director	Speech Pathology-Audiology
Betsy Clewett	Advising & Program Coordinator	Teacher Education
Edna P. DeHaven	Professor	Teacher Education
David P. Doerksen	Associate Professor	Music
Knute V. Espeseth	Associate Professor	Teacher Education
Jane Maitland-Gholson	Assistant Professor	Art Education
Terry L. Martin	Graduate Teaching Fellow	Teacher Education
Gordon J. Murphy	Academic Administrative Asst.	Biology
Richard J. Rankin	Professor	Education Psychology
Richard A. Schmuck	Director of Graduate Studies	Educational Policy and Management
David R. Sokoloff	Associate Professor and Associate Head	Physics
Stan B. Turner	Adjunct Assistant Professor	Teacher Education
Charles R. B. Wright	Professor and Head	Mathematics
Lois J. Youngen	Associate Professor	Physical Education and Human Movement
Oregon State University		
Kenneth H. Ahrendt	Associate Professor	Education
JoAnn Brewer	Assistant Professor	Education
Gene F. Craven	Associate Professor	Science
James Firth	Associate Professor	Education
Gerald E. Girod	Chairman	Elementary Education
Bill Hary	Associate Professor	Elementary Education
Larry J. Kennedy	Professor and Chairman	Vocational-Technical Education
Gilbert J. Knapp	Associate Professor	Music
Sylvia L. Lee	Professor	Home Economics
Norman Lederman	Assistant Professor	Science Education
Dow P. Poling	Associate Professor	Physical Education
Margaret Skeeba	Professor	Business Education
Lee Streidl	Assistant Professor	Media Education
Elaine Sutherland	Instructor	Home Economics Education
Ab Van Otten	Graduate Teaching Assistant	Science and Math Education
Carrol W. Wood	Professor	Education

Name	Title	Department
Portland State University		
Steve A. Brannan	Professor	Education
Charles J. Becker	Associate Professor	Health and Physical Education
Dave C. Cox	Assistant Professor	Education
Colin G. Dunkeld	Professor	Education
Marjorie Enneking	Professor	Mathematics
William Korach	Adjunct Assistant Professor	Education
Peggy Agostino Sharp	Assistant Professor	Education
Western Oregon State College		
Frank H. Balke	Associate Professor	Humanities
Carl Brandhorst	Associate Professor	Social Sciences
Meredith Brodsky	Assistant Professor	Education
Daniel G. Cannon	Professor	Art
Richard A. Davis	Professor	Theatre-Dance
Dennis W. Eddings	Professor	Humanities
Dennis J. Fahey	Professor	Education
Jean M. Ferguson	Professor	Elementary Education
Christine Foss	Instructor	Humanities
Elizabeth E. Hoyser	Professor	Elementary Education
Norman E. Koch	Professor	Elementary Education
Ron Leavitt	Assistant Professor	Special Education
William J. Funke	Associate Professor	Music
Marion O. Rossi	Associate Professor	Humanities
Francoise Schreiner	Instructor	Humanities
Edwin E. Snyder	Assistant Professor	Music
Peter C. Stone	Associate Professor	Art
Vernon E. Utz	Professor	Education
Edward B. Waggoner	Associate Professor	Humanities
Cathie Whyte	Acting Director LARC and Instructor	Educational Media and Technology
Southern Oregon State College		
Lorraine Shaff	Professor	Business